

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-11 are pending in the application. Claims 4, 6, 7 and 8 are amended. Claims 10 and 11 are allowed.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,260,979 to Parker et al. The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection. As recited in claim 1, the present invention includes “monitoring circuitry for monitoring the outputs of the at least two oscillators, wherein the monitoring circuitry includes a control loop with a VCO and **means for analog voltage monitoring of the VCO voltage** to determine if the oscillators are operating.” As part of the monitoring circuitry, analog circuitry is used for monitoring the voltage of the VCO. The Parker reference does not teach or suggest the use of analog circuitry for monitoring the voltage of the VCO to determine if the oscillators are operating. In contrast, the Parker reference describes using digital circuitry as described in the abstract and with reference to FIG. 8 which discloses the clock detector circuit.

As stated in the Parker abstract, to determine the validity of the input clock signals, the signals are sampled and stored by the reference signal in a predetermined manner. The input clock signal is valid if the samples of the input clock signal each have the same logic state after the sampling period. The input clock signal is invalid if the samples of the input clock signal have at least one different logic state after the sampling period. The monitor circuit uses the logic state of the sampled clock compared to a predetermined state to determine if the clock is operating. The signals are sampled based on a lower frequency RC oscillator to determine if they are operating normally or not. Therefore, it is clear that the Parker reference does not teach or

suggest “analog” monitoring of the VCO voltage. Applicant contends that claim 1 contains patentable subject matter and should be allowable.

Claims 2, 3, 5 and 9 are dependent claims dependent upon independent claim 1, and thus should be allowable for the above reasons as well as for the additional elements they contain.

Claims 4, 6, 7 and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant has rewritten claims 4, 6, 7 and 8 in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Applicant appreciates the Examiner’s allowance of claims 10 and 11.

Application No. 10/783,923
Response dated June 13, 2005
Reply to Office Action mailed June 2, 2005

The Applicant respectfully requests that the Patent Office or Examiner telephone the undersigned in the event a telephone conference would be helpful in advancing prosecution of the above-identified patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.

Dated: 6/15/2005

By: William K. Baxter
William K. Baxter
Reg. No. 41,606

Attorneys of Record for Applicant
GODFREY & KAHN, S.C.
780 North Water Street
Milwaukee, WI 53202-3590
Telephone: 414-273-3500
Facsimile: 414-273-5198
Email: wbaxter@gklaw.com

MW965205_1.DOC